Application No. Applicant(s) 09/993.299 REYNOLDS, DAVID L. Interview Summary Examiner **Art Unit** 3763 Catherine S. Williams All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) Catherine S. Williams. (4) . (2) Kenneth L. Mitchell. Date of Interview: 13 February 2004. Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference 2) applicant's representative c) Personal [copy given to: 1] applicant e)⊠ No. Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description: . Claim(s) discussed: 1. Identification of prior art discussed: Wilburn, Helixon,. Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) \times N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Regarding the placement of the piston being "spaced from the rimmed end". additionally claim language is needed. Suggested language is that the terms proximal and distal be used to reference the piston being on one side or the other of the rimmed end. No indication of allowance was given. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Kenneth 1. Milehus Feb. 13, 2004

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required 2 13 04